THE

EVANGELIST.

Go you into all the world, proclaim the good news to the whole creation:—he who believeth and is immersed shall be saved; and he who believeth not shall be condemned.

MESSIAH.

NO. 4. CINCINNATI, APRIL 1, 1833. VOL. 2.

CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN

A CATHOLIC AND A PROTESTANT.

A discussion between a Catholic, (a Mr. Hughes,) and a Presbyterian (a Mr. Breckenridge,) is now in issue, in Philadelphia: the debate is carried on in letters, and published in the Journals of the city: to give any more than an abstract of the discussion, would not comport with the limited pages of the Evangelist.

The general question, which must necessarily involve the settlement of many specific ones, seems to be; 'Is Popery, or Protestantism divine.'

Mr. Hughes, after some strictures on the multiplied and ever multiplying divisions of the Protestants, the rivalship of their creeds, and the infidelity to which these united causes have given rise, propounds as the fatal reason of all these evils,—the Protestant maxim of *private interpretation*, viz: The principle in Protestantism, which recognizes in every man the right of reading and interpreting the Bible for himself, without appealing to an infallible umpire as the Pope, —the Priests,—or the Church in her integral capacity.

The parties then join issue on the following question.

Is the Bible *alone* that practical rule established by Christ, to guide us in matters of religion, and to determine disputes in the Church?

Mr. Hughes, who takes the negative, proceeds in ten distinct paragraphs, to impugn the Protestant maxim, and to state his reasons why he does not believe the Bible alone to be the infallible rule, in matters of religion.

OBJECTION 1. The Bible including all the Old and all the New Testament, was not completed till half a century after Christ's ascension, and therefore could not have been given by him as an infallible rule.

2. The Bible no where proposes itself as an infallible rule.

3. What is meant by the Bible alone? The Bible on the shelf—or as you peruse it? And does it, or do you and it together, constitute the infallible rule?

4. Christians believe the Bible to be authentic and inspired, but this cannot be proved by the Bible alone, and therefore it cannot alone form an infallible rule.

5. It was not known until the end of the 5th century, what books were to be regarded as canonical, therefore Christ could not have given the Bible as an infallible rule.

6. Since the origin of Christianity, not so much as one dispute has been settled by the Bible alone.

7. The Bible operated on by private judgment, has been the cause of all division and heresy in the Protestant world.

8. Those who assume the Bible alone as an infallible rule, admit nevertheless, that they may be wrong.

9. The Bible alone, as applied in practice by the Protestants, has wrought the destruction of that unity for which such a rule is required, and therefore it cannot be the infallible rule given by Christ.

10. The Bible cannot be the infallible rule. Because instead of teaching the doctrines of Christ as positive *truths*, *facts*, it merely submits them to its votaries as opinions, held by the preacher, agreed to by those who drew up the confession of faith, and supposed to be contained in the Bible.

Mr. Hughes concludes by observing, that the importance of determining the 'Infallible Rule,' must be obvious to all. Stript of its verbiage, the first letter of Mr. Hughes, is substantially contained in the above abstract.

Mr. Breckenridge replies,

As controversy is clearly my duty, I think myself happy that it relates to a system, against which all Evangelical Protestants are united, and with whose rise or final overthrow, in the opinion of them all, the most precious hopes and the highest interests of men and nations, as well as the supreme honor of Jesus Christ, are inseparably blended.

The first point for discussion is the Rule of Faith; it is agreed there is an infallible rule.

1. Ours is 'The word of God, as contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.'

2. Yours is 'The Old and New Testaments, with the books called Apochrypha, as contained in the old Vulgate Latin Edition, and unwritten traditions interpreted by a visible infallible judge of controversies, according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.'

You introduce your attack on the protestant maxim of private *or individual interpretation* by a quotation from the 2d Epistle of the Apostle Peter, which, you suppose, is wholly reversed in its meaning by the Protestants, viz: '*No prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation.*' We, you suppose, make all scripture of private interpretation, we recognise the right in every Christian to read and interpret scripture for himself. Now hear Peter. 'We have also a more sure word of prophecy *to which you 'Christians' do well to give heed:*' Not a word about obscurity, private interpretation relates not to the

obscurity of the text, for there is no obscurity there, but to the propheey and the prophets, who delivered it in olden time, not by private interpretation, or motion, but by the interpretations or motions of the Holy Spirit.

Now let us look at your rule. You have an infallible judge of controversy; you at least say so:—now for the proof of what you say; you find the proof of his existence in the scripture of course: but how do you find it;—how do you interpret the scriptures which discover to you the existence of this judge? Do you interpret them fallibly or infallible? Not infallibly, for as yet you have not ascertained who the infallible interpreter of scripture is. And if you have only your own reason and private judgment to determine from scripture who this infallible judge is, do you not discover him ultimately, by the very protestant rule which you condemn?

Again, when you have by a fallible rule, determined the existence of an infallible judge, you have then to seek the true Church, the only institution on earth in which he is to be found. Belarmine numbers from scripture 15 notes or marks of the true Church. Thus fallible men by private or individual interpretation first find out from scripture the true Church, afterwards the infallible judge; and having done so, return backward with him to learn infallibly what the word of God means. But when you have got the decrees, confessions, bulls, &c. of this infallible judge, are they better or more clear than our scriptures? Can your judge be more lucid than our Lord Jesus Christ?

Mr. Breckenridge then answers Mr. Hughe's ten objections, in ten distinct paragraphs, number for number; and finally oppugns the Catholic procedure in ten paragraphs more, which concludes his letter.

1. The Bible, you say, was not written till half a century after Christ's death. A very small part of the New Testament was not written till 50 years after the death of Christ; but it is a bold figure of speech to say, 'The Bible was not written till that time.'

2. You require the chapter and verse in which the Bible proposes itself as an infallible rule. 'All scripture, says the Apostle, is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and instruction in righteousness, and is given, that the man of God may be *perfect*, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.' Here, Sir, is chapter and verse, and tell me what is wanting. See 2d Tim. 3d chap. and 16th verse.

3. You enquire does the Bible on the shelf, or you and the Bible together constitute the infallible rule? and you afterwards reason thus—The Bible on the shelf is *one*, and the man who reads it makes *two*; therefore, the Bible *alone* is not the only rule, and as the man who reads it is fallible, therefore the Bible is not an infallible rule. This Sir, is profound indeed, but such logic, Dear Sir, will not soon assert your claims to infallibility.

4. You demand a proof of the authenticity and inspiration of the scriptures from the Bible *alone*.

In all such cases as the one in question, something is *pre-supposed*, for example, if a man admits the truth of divine Revelation; that he previously had admitted the existence of God, the author of the Revelation, will be understood by all; and so in adopting the Bible to be our '*Infallible Rule*' of faith and practice, all will understand, that we had previously and first of all deter-

mined its authenticity and inspiration. We do not admit and then enquire, but enquire into its authenticity, and then admit it as our rule. But your latent meaning in the 4th paragraph, is, that we need the Church to tell us what is Bible! and so you would prove the Church by the Bible, and the Bible by the Church, your argument running in a constant circle and proving nothing but its own absurdity.

5. Here you argue, that the canon of scripture was not understood universally before the end of the fifth century. If this were the case, then what was your infallible judge doing all this time? and if during all this period there was no infallible judge to settle the canon of scripture, what becomes of your infallible rule?

But I deny the validity of your objection. Some contend that the canon of scripture was settled by the Apostle John. Origen in 2 0, Eusebius in 315, Athanasius in 315, Cyril in 340, the Council of Laodicia in 364, give catalogues of the inspired books, and most of them are exact catalogues of the New Testament.

6 and 7. You say the *Bible alone* has never settled any dispute, but promoted them. Poor Bible! What a transgressor thou hast been! Sir, our rule of faith is a *sufficient* not a *compulsory* one, and in this it differs from your own. How did you settle the dispute with the Albegnses, the Waldenses,—with the Greek Church, and finally, with the Reformers? But sir, in examining the Protestant rule of faith, you do not discriminate between the *use* and the *abuse* of a thing.

8 and 9. Your 8th and 9th heads are only changes rung upon the same fallacious reasoning expounded above.

10. The argument on certainty, (of the voice of scripture,) I have answered in the introduction.

And now sir, having waded through your queries, I would also expect a prompt reply to the following difficulties.

1. Are you infallible in finding out the notes of your Church;—and is it not done by private, or at least fallible judgment?

2. Is your infallible judge the Pope, or a general council, or both united, or the Church at large?

3. You say your Church is not hostile to the reading and dissemination of the scriptures: How does this comport with the *Expurgatory Index* of the Council of Trent and the Pope? There it is said—'If any one have the presumption to read the Bible without a written permission from Bishops or Inquisitors, he shall not receive absolution until he has first delivered up the Bible.'

4. Your living judge of controversy being infallible, your system should be uniform and unchangeable;—How came it then that in the 4th century, Liberius the Pope, signed the Arian creed—and with him the people. While Pope Honorius, in the 7th century, was condemned as a heretic? You all differ on the *Popes supremacy*, and as to *the seat of infallibility* in the Church, there is neither union nor uniformity among you. You have not yet settled which are *general councils*, and as to *the validity of oaths*, the councils are horribly guilty; denying the cup to the laity, did not commence until the 12th century; were they infallible who gave and infallible who withheld it?

5. Your oath binds you to interpret 'unwritten traditions' and the Bible, according to the unanimous consent of the fathers. Now I ask, is there any unanimity among them, and if not, how can your rule be applied?

6. What proof have you of the Apocryphal book's claims to be enrolled in the sacred canon, seeing they were rejected by the Jews, the Saviour, his Apostles, and by the *earliest* fathers?

7. What right has the church of Rome to make unwritten traditions, a part of the rule of Faith?

8. Belief rests on *evidence** not *dictation*, how then do you assert we must *believe* what the church believes?

9. Your infallible judge has taught doctrines which contradict the natural senses of mankind—transubstantiation. It is also abhorrent and irreverent, that a priest can make his God, sacrifice him, give him to the people, worship him and then eat him!

10. Your system ought to be perfect in regard to morals, but I can shew you that it is not. Paul 3d, in a memorable letter to three distinguished prelates, mentions abuses as follows—Ordaining youth of evil manners—Simony—Pastors entrusting their flocks to hirelings—the degeneracy of Monks—Sacrileges with the Nuns—Rome corrupt, and the name of Christ forgotten among us;—And these, sir, are the things which led the Reformers, those few individuals as you call them, to assert that your church was corrupt and needed reform,

Yours respectfully, &c.

We are not Presbyterians, but we are Protestants, and feel the divine excellence of that great and glorious maxim in the Reformation, which recognizes in every son of man the inherent right to read and understand the scriptures for himself; we therefore wish not mere success to Mr. Breckenridge, we pray God he may be greatly victorious; yea, that he may come off more than conqueror through Christ; may he triumph! May he inflict a wound upon the beast from which he shall never recover within the happy abodes of our Republic.—Ed.

* This is the very doctrine of our Ancient Gospel, for which we are so shamefully treated by all parties, in their conversations and public journals.—Ed.

IMPORTANT QUESTIONS

FROM

BRO. DR. WINANS

ANSWERED.

Dear Bro. Scott:

I have read your new version of your Essay on the Holy Spirit, and your answers to sundry questions. I, like many others, had supposed, that—

receiving the Holy Spirit, being *baptized* with the Holy Spirit, and the *gift* of the Holy Spirit, had different meanings; but you say, in answer to Question 2d, that all these expressions mean the same thing, viz: the reception of the Holy Spirit.

QUESTIONS.

QUESTION 1st. 'In John chap 20, v. 22, it is written, that, 'He Jesus, breathed on them, the Apostles, and said, 'Receive ye the Holy Spirit.' If, then, the *reception* of and *baptism* in the Holy Spirit, mean the same thing,—were not the Apostles twice baptized in the Holy Spirit?'

ANSWER. No, they were baptized in the Holy Spirit only once, viz: on the day of Pentecost; and your question resolves itself into the following

QUESTION. Did the Apostles receive the Holy Spirit when Christ breathed on them?

ANSWER. I think they did not, because

1st. Jesus, after his resurrection, did not receive the promised Spirit until he was glorified; now, what he had not yet received, he could not yet bestow! And what was not given to the disciples before the glorification of Jesus, could not, before that time, be received by them; therefore they did not receive the Holy Spirit when Jesus breathed on them.

2d. John chap. 7, v. 39, and Peter, Acts chap. 10, and chap. 15, call the pouring, coming, falling, or baptism of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost and afterwards, the reception of the Spirit.

What then did Jesus mean by, 'Receive ye the Holy Spirit?' Did he mean, 'Receive ye the Holy Spirit' *now?* Oh no; but, receive ye the Spirit on the day when I shall give it; viz: Pentecost: and with this agree both the fact, and Jesus' subsequent language concerning it.

Just before the ascension, Jesus said; 'Wait for the promise of the Father, which you have heard of me:' again, 'you shall *receive* power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you.' He also said, 'Go ye into all the world;' but he did not mean, go *now;* for they were to tarry at Jerusalem for the Spirit before they went; so when he said, 'receive the Holy Spirit,' he did not mean *receive it now;* for they had to tarry at Jerusalem till Christ was glorified, received it, and sent it: there is therefore but one sending, coming, falling, pouring, or baptism of the Holy Spirit, and that is when any of the disciples receive the Spirit.

QUESTION 2d. 'If the reception of the Spirit, and baptism in the Spirit, mean the same thing; then, are not all we, who now obey the gospel in these times, baptized in the Spirit?'

Yes; all, who receive the Spirit of God in Christ, are baptized in that Spirit according to the figurative use of this term, baptize, which is employed in reference to the gift of God's Spirit simply on account of the overwhelming attribute of the literal ordinance of baptism in water by John, which first suggested and gave rise to this figurative and rhetorical use of it.

QUESTION 3d. 'Paul says, Eph. chap. 4., 'There is one baptism.' But if we are all baptized first in the water and afterwards in the Holy Spirit, are there not two baptisms? And if there be but one, are not the Quakers right when they assert, that baptism in the Spirit is that one?'

Doctor, this question in both its points is a most puzzling looking one; it appears like the very *crux interpretationis*, and you would seem to dash a man with vengeance between the horns of a dilemma: shall I dare assert, there are two baptisms in Christianity, when the Apostle declares there is but one? Or asserting as I fearlessly do, that we are baptized in water and in the Holy Spirit, shall I play the sophist and prove by a puzzle, that two baptisms make one baptism? Your question, sir, might give *asphyxia* to a Dervis! but I shall not evade but meet the difficulty; I shall not cut but untie the Gordian knot, in which you have suspended my sentiments.

And now observe, that in counting a literal species we never include those things which bare the name of that species figuratively: for example, the christians are called sheep, but in numbering the sheep which are in the world, you would not count the christians among them, merely because they bore that name by a figure. Christ is called a Lion and a Lamb, but in numbering Lions and Lambs you would not count Christ one! would you? O! very well, it is just so in counting baptisms in Christianity; you must not number those things which are called baptism by a figure, for then you would have three or four of them! e.g. Christ's sufferings are styled a baptism; and in the same scripture the apostles' sufferings are called a baptism: the reception of the spirit is named baptism; and then we have baptism in water, which would make four baptisms in Christianity on this plan of numbering: but, literally, there is, as Paul says, but 'one Baptism,' viz: Baptism in water.

As for the Quakers, who count the figurative, and reject the literal baptism, they are guilty of a mistake similar to that of the man, who, in numbering the sheep which are in the world, leaves out all those animals which bare the name litterally, and count men, or Christians, to whom it is given figuratively.

But Quakers, like all who are ignorant of the Original Institu-

tute of Christianity, are to be taught not *stumpt;* fed not gorged, and to say that baptism in the Spirit was limited to the first fruits of the Jews and the Gentiles—the 120 on the day of Pentecost and the house of Cornelius, merely to *choke a Quaker*, is unworthy of our Reformation whose march along the high places of sectarianism, claims to be enlightened and directed by the day-star of the divine oracles.

Show me the man, who in confuting an adversary, generously and greatly declines all factitious aid, and throws himself and his cause on truth and manly argument! his fame!

QUESTION 4th. 'Was the *coming*, *pouring*, and *falling* of the Spirit, which took place after Pentecost, from the church or from heaven:—if from heaven, how say you, that on the day of Pentecost, the Spirit took up his abode in the church?'

ANS. Does man divest himself of his spirit in imparting it to his children? O no; well then, neither does God divest himself of his spirit in imparting it to his children; from the day of Pentecost, the Holy Spirit was in the church and in no other institution under heaven; but the church is God's family, his sons and daughters; and while they received and were made partakers of the Spirit of God, it was not in such a manner as to divest God and and Christ of it: they are all of one family, and as children of the same family do not propagate the Spirit of that family or communicate it to each other; so in the royal family of Heaven, the residue of the Spirit is with the Father, and consequently the *coming*, *falling* and *pouring* about which you enquire was from Heaven, not from the Church; and mark me, Beloved, it comes from God now, as certainly as it did then, and happy shall we be if we walk in the Spirit which we have received of God, for if we do, we shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh.

QUESTION 5th. 'You say, the disciples of Jesus were sanctified by the Holy Spirit. But Jesus, in his prayer for his disciples, prayed, 'Sanctify them by the truth, thy word is truth.' Is the word of God and the Spirit of God the same thing? If so, do not the reception, the coming, the falling, the baptism, the gift of the Spirit, and the word of God, all mean the same thing?'

ANS. The same things may be predicated of two subjects, which are specifically and generically distinct. A and B may both be fathers, but this would not prove A and B to be the same person; the Church is said to be sanctified by God, the Father and also by a bath of water; but this does not prove God and baptism to be

the same thing: we are said to be sanctified by faith, and by the blood of Christ; but faith and the blood of Christ are distinct matters; and so of the *word* of God, and the *Spirit* of God; for although the Scriptures say, we are sanctified by both, yet they by no means intend to teach, that the *word* and the *Spirit* are the same thing, or an identity; this indeed were an absurdity; and if they, at any time, say the Spirit is the truth, it must be by some trope or figure; for the word of God is no more the Spirit of God than our word is our spirit. In our late struggle after reformation, the disciples had, almost universally, fallen into the blunder which you have supposed; we have then to thank God, who has rewarded our sincerity and enquiries with more correct views on this subject.

QUESTION 6th. 'If the Spirit be put forth in a word, does not the Spirit still retain its former location?'

ANS. Certainly it does; but, *Spirit put forth in a word!* what meaneth this? Methinks it were as wise to say, a bow put forth in an arrow! or a gun put forth in the bullet, which is shot from it! No spirit can put itself forth from its proper location by a word; you may make the experiment on a block of wood, or of marble, or on a man, if you choose, and you cannot give him your spirit by your word; you may by your words, stirr up in him certain dormant feelings, and passions of his own Spirit, which shall resemble your own feelings and passions, and you may by a rhetorical trope or figure say, you have given him your Spirit, as when a general stirreth up his soldiery to glorious war, but this is all.

This, however, is not what the Scriptures mean by giving the spirit of God. He came *without a word* from Heaven, and after the word had been both heard, understood, believed, and obeyed by those who received him. He came on the day of Pentecost after the Saviour was glorified, and it will be best for all of us always to speak and think on this subject as the scriptures speak of it.

When Dr. Bradon was rector of Etham, in Kent, the text he one day undertook to preach from, was, 'Who art thou?' After reading the text, he made (as was his custom) a pause, for the congregation to reflect upon the words; when a gentleman in a military dress, who at the instant was marching very stately up the middle isle of the church, supposing it to be addressed to him, to the surprise of all present, replied, 'I am, Sir, an officer of the seventeenth foot, on a recruiting party here, and having brought my wife and family with me, I wish to be acquainted with the neighboring clergy and gentry.' This so disconcerted the divine, and astonished the congregation, that, though they attempted to listen with decorum, the discourse was not proceeded in, without considerable difficulty.

SACRED COLLOQUY.

No. 14.

Now belief is the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen. Heb. 11 chap. verse 1.

Mr. St. Christianity having, in the 11th chap. of the Heb., secured all her children in the po-session of an infallible definition of that fundamental principle of belief, on which it has pleased the author of our redemption to rear the divine institution, it behooves all of us to do her the greatest reverence; and to exercise our best judgment and highest reason in deciding upon the import of that definition which she has been pleased to submit to man, for his right gui dance in so important a concern.

Having, in our last, seen, that in the dialect of scripture, faith and belief are synonymous, and that the Greek word *pistis* is rendered indifferently by *faith* and *belief* in the present version of the New Testament, we shall now enquire what that mental thing is, which is described by the Apostles, under the terms faith or belief.

It may here be observed, that, in most cases of faith or belief, three things are pre-eminently conspicuous; viz: 1st, the proposition submitted for belief; 2d, the person submitting it; and 3d, the evidence or testimony purporting to sustain the proposition to be believed; and the essential difference between natural, or political, and religious belief, is, that in this last, or religious belief, the proposition, the proof and the person submitting them, are all divine; for as to the sense, and reason, and understanding, and will of the creature, the exercise of these is as rigorously necessary in religious, as in either natural, civil or political belief.

But whatever may be the import of the terms in the definition of faith supplied by the providence of the Holy Spirit in Hebrews, it is most certain from the things afterwards adduced by the Apostle, as illustrative of his meaning, that our faith can look *backward* and *forward*, and that, consequently, the objects of it may be either behind or before us; i. e. the things proposed for our belief may have transpired before we were born, as the creation of the world: or they may have yet to transpire after we are dead, as the resurrection of the dead; when the objects of belief are in the past, they are styled in this definition, '*things unseen*,' as the creation; and when they are in the future, they are called '*things hoped for*,' as the resurrection.

Mr. Locke declared that what had just been spoken was most elegant, and was in perfect harmony with what followed in the chapter referred to. The Apostle, continued he, in looking to the '*unseen things*' of the past says, verse 3d. 'By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God', and in speaking of the holy women, who endured tortures, he describes them,

verse 35, as not accepting deliverance, '*that they might* obtain a better resurrection,' *the thing they hoped for.*

Mr. R. said, that Mr. St's assertion concerning the objects of faith, being in the *past* and in the *future*, Mr. R. added, that, though the catechism, and the definition of faith found in it, had been voted from the present enquiry, he knew an author, a Presbyterian, for whose learning and candour, Reformers had manifested a decided reverence, and he would, if consistent with the feelings and judgment of the brethren present, read, from the edition of the author's works, which was in his hand, what he had written on the terms of the Apostolic definition in question.

Messrs. St. and Locke bowed; and Mr. R. proceeded to read from McKnight, on the Epistles, the following notes on the several terms, '*substance*,' '*things hoped for*,' '*evidence*,' '*things unseen.*'

Verse 1.—1.—*Faith is the confidence.* So our translators have rendered the word *hupostasis*, Heb. 3–14. But the Greek commentators taking the word in its etymological meaning, explain the clause thus: Faith gives a present subsistence to the future things which are hoped for.

2. *Things hoped for*, namely, the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the creation of the new heavens and the new earth, the introduction of believers into the heavenly country, and their possessing its joys forever.—Here it is proper to remark, that *hope* hath for its object only the things promised. Whereas, besides these, *faith* hath for its objects all the declarations of God, concerning things not seen.

3. *And the evidence.* The word *elenghos* denotes *a strict proof* or *demonstration*; a proof that thoroughly convinces the understanding, and determines the will. The Apostle's meaning is, that faith answers all the purposes of a demonstration, because being founded on the veracity and power of God, these perfections are to the believer complete evidence of the things which God declares have happened, or are to happen, however much they may be out of the ordinary course of nature.

4. *Of things not seen.* These, as distinguished from the things hoped for, are the creation of the world, without any pre-existing matter to form it of; the destruction of the old world by the deluge, ver. 7.; the glory which Christ had with the Father before the world began, his miraculous conception in the womb of his mother, his resurrection from the dead, his exaltation in the human nature, to the government of the universe; the sin and punishment of the angels, &c. All which we believe, on the testimony of God, as firmly as if they were set before us by the evidence of sense.

Mr. St. said, he thought the matter exceedingly intelligible now; he thought the great translator of the Epistles had left almost nothing more to be enquired after; that King Jame's translators having, in the 3d Heb. rendered the Greek '*hupostasis*' by the English word confidence, he concluded from all he had heard, as well as from the illustrations from the whole eleventh chapter, that

the Apostolic definition, in point of sense, amounted to this, that faith was confidence in the word of God, whether that word related to things in the past, or future, things hoped for, or things unseen: and such a confidence too, as was equal to a sensible demonstration—a confidence like that which is possessed by one who beholds facts as they transpire before his own eyes.

Nearly the whole company echoed assent, and more than one declared, they were happy to assure their brethren, that what had been said, in relation to Paul's definition of faith, corresponded with the state of their own believing minds,—their faith in the '*true sayings of God*,' whether they related to the past, as the creation, the fall, the flood, the call; or to the future, as the resurrection, the judgment, and life eternal, amounted, they knew, to the confidence described; they believed these matters as if they had had an ocular demonstration of them; and could no more deny them than they could their own existence!

One of the brethren begged to enquire, whether the ideas which had been given of religious belief *in general*, applied to the Apostolic belief *in particular*.

The affirmative was agreed to on all hands; for it was the same God, who spoke to Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Sarah, Moses, Gideon, Barack, Sampson, Samuel, David, and the Prophets, that had in latter times submitted for the *belief of the world* the great Christian proposition and its evidences.

'*Behold my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*'

Apostolic faith, then, the true, precious, saving, and victorious faith of the Gospel, is nothing but *confidence* in this superb declaration of the Almighty: and we christians as confidently believe Jesus to be God's son, as we do that God exists. Indeed, if Christ is not God's son, then there is no religion in the world; and if there is no religion now, there never will be any; and if there never will be religion in the world, then there is no maker to the world; and if the world has no maker, there is no God! and the world may say, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.'

The Presbyterian Doctor said, the Reformers affected an overweaning regard for the facts of scripture as they called them, while, to himself at least, they appeared but little solicitous about the doctrines connected with these facts; that Jesus Christ was the son of God, was a naked matter by itself; every body almost, believed that.

Mr. St. a little touched by the last words of Mr. R., said he would beg leave to ask, whether a fact revealed from heaven by God himself; a fact for which Christ shed his precious blood; a fact on which he had founded his Church; a fact on the confession of which, disciples were admitted into the Christian institution; a fact which had employed the united pens of the Holy Evangelists; a fact, in short, which sustained all other facts in christianity, could with any degree of safety be discoursed of in such style? Meanwhile, he would be happy

to listen to Mr. R., while he supplied the company with some matters illustrative of the distinction, which he had just made between *facts* and *doctrines*.

Mr. R. said he did not wish to derogate from the magnitude and majesty of the proposition in question. He would even admit, that no man could be a christian without believing it.

The distinction, he hoped, could be very easily illustrated, e. g. The proposition '*Jesus died*' was a fact; but '*Jesus died for our sins*,' he would style a doctrine; 'Christ has arisen from the dead was a fact;' but he has arisen from the dead, for our justification, was a doctrine.

Mr. St. said, this was a distinction made without a real difference; the sun shines, and the sun shines to give light were equally facts; grain grows, and grain grows for the use of man; it rains, and it rains to water the earth, were equally facts all of them! This, moreover, was an unscriptural use of the word doctrine; at the same time, the Reformers were certainly indebted to Mr. R. for his serene charity in supposing, that they dis-sociated from the death, resurrection, and exaltation of Christ, the purposes of remission, the Holy Spirit and life eternal, which they had introduced.

Upon the whole, christian faith is neither more nor less than a confidential repose in the declaration of Almighty God, when he says

'*Behold my Son, the beloved, in whom I delight!*'

'To him who lov'd the sons of men,
And washed us in his blood;
To royal honors raised our heads,
And made us priests to God.
To him let every tongue be praise.'

ELECTION

AND

The 9th Chapter of the Romans.

The brother who writes from Kentucky, for my views on Election and the 9th chap of the Romans, will find 2 pieces on these subjects in the 6th Vol of the Christian Baptist pages 170—228 and over the signature Philip.

If, however, the following shall prove of any immedia'e value to the enquirer, his acceptance of it will sufficiently repay me for the trouble of writing it.

I shall suppose myself a physician, having an only Son, and possessing at the same time a medicament, a medicine or panacea, equal to the cure of all manner of diseases;

Well I own land, and have concluded to build a city, which, I forsee, will shortly be crowded with inhabitants, untill it contains millions.

I forsee, also, that the population of said city will taste of the misery incident to humanity,—that every class of disease will find a lodging within their walls—Febers, phlegmasiæ, cutanei, profluvia, suppressiones, neuroses, cachexiæ, and locales with all their orders, genera, species and variety of species.

Now, what must I do? my medicament is my own, and on that account, I may do

with it as I please: I may give it; I may give it too on such terms as I please; and if I please I may withhold it, if my sovereign pleasure runs in that direction; but I am benevolent, and my benevolence prompts me not to withhold, but to bestow it for the good of the wretched inhabitants of the immense city which I have founded and built.

Well, I say to my son, son, thou knowest, even as I do, the virtue and value of the medicament in my possession: with me also thou foreseest, that the population of the city, which we are about to build, will need it; and it is my sovereign pleasure to bestow it upon them for their benefit: but the terms;—on what terms shall each invalid partake of it?

My son replies: Father, thy wisdom is sufficient for the case; but if you bestow it on account of superiour wealth, the rich will despise the poor; if it be given to the poor only, this will destroy in those who receive it, the reverence due from them to their fellow citizens: moreover such a partial distribution of the favour would not meet the case, for rich and poor will equally experience the tortures of disease; they will stand in equal want of relief, and will be equally deserving of it.

If fame, or family, or office, or personal attraction, or age, or youth, or genius, or stupidity, or mental distinction of any kind, or any quality of a nature purely accidental be selected as a principle or ground on which, and for which the favor shall be conferred, then thy benevolence will be impeached; the state of the case will not be met; and men will blame thy partiality.

Son, I reply, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine, what thou hast just stated is wise and righteous. The accidents of wealth, and fame, and professional distinction, are all of too limitted a nature to meet the exigencies of the case; therefore, in accordance with my better benevolence and thine own wisdom, I shall select a *principle*, which shall put the *great* good equally within the reach of all who shall need it, whether rich or poor, or men of fame, or men of inferior renown, the high, the low, the wise, the foolish, the young, the old, of both sexes, and of all ages, and conditions in the city.

I shall select *belief*; and as all men can believe on proper and adequate testimony, this will bring the possession of the favour equally within the reach of all; this is my sovereign decree, and the point at which my absolute pleasure shall obtain, yes I, of myself, ordain that all who believe thee to be my son, the dispenser of this good, and will submit their future health to thy guidance, shall partake of the benefit,—shall be cured and cured for ever of whatever malady they may be possessed and I myself shall introduce thee to the citizens as '*my son, the beloved in whom my soul delitheth.*'*

Now, sir, please observe the points at which my sovereignty does *not* obtain; and you will then more distinctly conceive of the points at which it actually *does* obtain.

1st. My sovereignty does not discover itself in decreeing that certain individuals, high and low, or rich and poor, shall *believe.*

2nd. Nor in decreeing, that certain other individuals high and low, or rich and poor, shall *disbelieve.*

3d Nor do I elect men to believe, that they may be cured, but

1st. I elect them to be cured because they believe.†

---

*If the reader reflect on the illustration of election given above, he will perceive, that *God's sovereignty* as exhibited in Christianity, and appearing in the selection of the universal principal of faith, and in granting salvation to all on that principle, *is his grace*; his *sovereignty* and his *grace* are an identity in our religion, and the distinction between *sovereign* grace and *free* grace, about which Methodists and Calvanists contend, has, in reality, no existence but in their own imaginations; it is a ridiculous and destructive fable; more remarkable for nothing than the strife which it has engendered.

†Suppose the city to be built and the time fully come for the exhibition of the medicine, the son is introduced and the people believe and are cured. This is Election, the general Election; but suppose again, that the good Physician wished to communicate his Panacea to the world—the whole world; then he requires Apostles—this would be a special election, or an election of individuals for special purposes. Well he selects

2d. I ordain faith as the principle on which cure shall be administered.

3. In these *two* points, then, the selection of *belief* and *believers* to be cured does my sovereignty discover itself.

Corollories 1. Though it cannot be deduced from the above, that men are chosen to *believe;* it is most obvious, that they are chosen to be cured through, or on account of their belief.

2d. And as their belief terminates on my son, then, strictly and properly, they are chosen in him, i. e. when they are found not *out of*, but *in* him by faith, then they are chosen to be cured, and may receive the medicine.

3d. Again as the whole scheme of election as regards my son, belief, and believers, was settled before the city was built, then all, who shall be cured, may be said to be chosen to this good in my son before the foundation of the city!

4th. And last, in selecting *belief*, and in administering the cure on account of it, I gave to the citizens the highest proof of my philanthropy. In short my sovereignty and benevolence are here an identity, they are the same thing.

Now then to apply all this to religion, the christian religion: Let God take the place of the benevolent physician; Jesus the place of the son; and let pardon, &c. be put for the medicine.

And then, God's sovereignty and benevolence are displayed in proposing *faith*, and in pardoning those of men who have this *faith*.

1. He has not decreed, as Calvanists affirm, that certain of mankind shall believe and be forgiven in preference to others.

2. Nor, that certain others of them shall disbelieve, and be forever damned; but

His public decree is 'Go ye unto all the world, proclaim the good news to the whole creation: He, who believes and is baptized, shall be saved: He, who believes not shall be condemned.'

And though it is never said in scripture, that men are chosen to faith, yet it is actually declared, that they are chosen through faith.

And as this faith terminates on the Son of God we are, therefore, said to be chosen in him.

But the whole scheme was framed before the foundation of the world, and therefore we are said to be chosen in him before the foundation of the world.

And, finally, as all this originated in the sovereign pleasure and benevolence of God, hence we are said to be saved by his grace, his will, the good pleasure of his will, his philanthrophy, &c. &c.

Now for the 9th chap. of the Romans.

Pardon by *faith* in Christ, then, is the great subject preached and defended by the Apostle in this extraordinary epistle.

This doctrine had been committed to Paul by the saviour according to the will of God, the father, to be proclaimed to the heathen.

This the Jews greatly abhorred and declared that the detested doctrine.

1. Deprived them, the Jews, of all pre-eminence over the Gentiles.

2. That righteousness or pardon was attainable only by the Mosaic institute.

3. The Apostolick doctrine was, they said, no better than, 'Let us sin, that grace may abound.'

4. It set aside the Law, they supposed.

5. God's promise to Abraham and his seed for ever was wholly at war with it, &c.

Now the Apostle after settling the premises concerning good and evil, nature and revelation, law and gospel in the beginning of the epistle. Comes to discourse of *pardon*

---

from among the cured 12 to preach his medicine to the world, and men every where believe and are cured, and commit their future health to the guidance of their great Physician: but for social purposes these disciples or converts are congregated into bodies great or small as the case may be: this gives birth to another election, viz: that of Bishops and Deacons; and thus the whole business of general and special election is concluded,

by *faith* under the several names of *righteousness, a righteousness of God, a righteousness without law, righteousness imputed, remission of sins that are past, justification, redemption, reconciliation, &c. &c.* until he arrives at the 9th chap. in which he defends God's sovereign right to propose this christian doctrine to mankind, and to admit to mercy and pardon all among Jews and Gentiles who *believe* in his son Jesus Christ; and also his right to reject all who disbelieved it.

The Apostle's mode of arguing with his countrymen in this chapter, is of the simplest and most forcible kind.

Argument 1. God, in his sovereign pleasure, had chosen Abraham's seed by Isaac in preference to Ishmael, whom he rejected from this honor.

2. He had elected Jacob and rejected Esau according to his own will before ever the children were born, or had done, either good or evil.

3. He had raised Pharoah to the throne of Egypt in order that by the wicked wretch, he might display both his power and his long suffering.

4. He had, by Moses in their own scriptures, claimed the right to have mercy on whom he pleased, and of hardening whom he pleased.

5. He had the kingdom of this world, yea the world itself under his sovereign control as the potter hath the clay. and therefore he might and would act, according to the good pleasure of his will with good and evil men. No sovereignty, no God.

The conclusion to the whole matter was, that God had rejected the infidel part of the Jewish nation from their high standing as his people.

And, that he had elevated to that distinction 'even us, christians, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles.'

In short, it was a fact, that, by this impartial and benevolent scheme of bestowing forgiveness on the principle of *faith* in Jesus, the *Gentiles* found what they were not looking for: while the Jews, who stumbled at its levelling nature, fairly missed what they had waited for during 15 centuries from Moses to Jesus.

ADMONITION.

Let us, who are waiting for Christ's second coming, take heed, that we do not miss what we are looking for; let us seek for glory in the appointed way—by walking by faith—by keeping the commandments of Jesus—by taking care of widows and orphans—by feeding the hungry—by clothing the naked—by relieving the distressed; for if the Jews missed pardon because they sought it by works of the law alone, the Gentiles are equally liable to miss glory, because they seek it by faith of the gospel alone.

RESTORATION OF THE ANCIENT GOSPEL.

LETTER No. 4.

Sir,

Can you return with me to 1827? Can you imagine yourself seated on some lofty peak upon the sea beat shore, the wild ocean at your feet, spreading wide, and covered over with innumerable vessels, some at hand, some afar off, and all of them with canvass in full display to catch the living breezes as they blow?

If you can, the picture will afford us no incorrect medium through which to take a rapid retrospective view of Christianity, up to the period referred to.

Do you behold that huge vessel furtherest off, and hanging heavily upon the skirts of the horizon?—She is a majestic first rate man of war; grand, gloomy, and

enterprising, she boasts immense victories and has triumphed over the kings of the earth, even now she carries aboard a vast amount of money and of necessaries in provisions, drink, furniture, apparel, ordinance and apparatus of every kind! Her merchandize is gold and silver, and percious stones, and pearls, and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all thyine wood, and all manner vessels of ivory, and all manner vessels of most precious wood, and brass, and iron, and marble and cinnamon, and odours, and ointments, and frank-incense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men! glorying in her veneration and grandeur, she boasts an ancient lanch, and views as even beneath contempt the comparatively small craft by which she is beset and condemned; she carries in men a number equal to the third part of the stars of heaven, her course is westward, her pilot the Pope, and her name is I. N. R. Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth.

That ship next to her, of still greater extent, and finer mould, is of Grecian construction; she is guided in her course, which is chiefly eastward, by men in splendid habiliments; these are the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria. Her name which you see upon her stern in the Greek character, is *Helena.* 1200.

The crowd of vessels, varying in their sizes from the largest to the smallest, and sailing chiefly towards the north, is known by the general name of the Reformation 1522: but the numerous ships of which the fleet is composed, bare their respective names, which have been adopted as chance or whim, or ambition or prejudice, gave birth to them.

Do you observe, next in size and show to the splendid vessels which we have just been looking at, one in the front of the Reformation. That vessel derives her name from the famous and gigantic genius by whom she was lanched and built; she is called '*The Lutheran.*'

And that one next to her with a red flag, and sailing towards the British Isles, is styled '*The Episcopacy,*' and was built in the times of good King Harry the 8th. The Corvette fast by her side, and so piquant in the display of her rigging with some keen eyed men aboard, is named '*The Presbyterian,*' 1530. Did you ever see Calvin or Knox? that is Calvin at the helm, and that is the Scotch Apostle hard by his side.

What small ship is that sailing near to the Presbyterian, with men aboard of a gloomy, stern and resolute appearance?

Ah, Sir, that is a famous vessel among the small craft of the Reformation, and has been guided and guarded by men of the first mould, she is strictly speaking 'The Caledonia, 1643, and the men you enquire after are called Covenanters.' During the storm of religious persecution which raged in Scotland, the Covenanters were hunted from craig to glen, throughout the highlands. The story of their sufferings is almost incredible. Nothing can be more affecting than the measures they took to enjoy the privileges of religious worship. Watches were stationed from hill to hill—men so sun burnt and worn out that they could hardly be distinguished from the heather of the mountains, who gave a note of alarm on the approach of danger, and the Covenanters had time to

disperse before the bloody swords gleamed in the retreats in which they worshipped. In the gloomy caverns and recesses made by the awful hand that fashioned Scotland's mountain scenery, these martyrs, each one mourning some dear friend, who had been hunted down by the destroyers, met and heard the mysterious words of God, and sung such wild songs of devotion, that they might have been thought the chantings of the mountain spirits. As their sufferings increased, their sermons and devotional exercises approached nearer to the soul chilling trumpetings of the ancient prophets, when they foresaw desolation coming out of the north like a whirlwind?'

The Poet Graham, describes them thus

> But years more gloomy, followed; and no more
> The assembled people dared to meet, in face of day,
> To worship God, or even at the dead
> Of night, save when the wintry storm raved fierce.
> And thunder peals compelled the men of blood,
> To couch within their dens; then dauntlessly
> The scattered few would meet, in some deep dell,
> By rocks o'er canopied, to hear the voice
> Their faithful pastor's voice; He, by the gleam
> Of sheeted lightenings, oped the sacred book
> And words of comfort spake: over their souls
> His soothing accents came,—as to her young
> The heath-fowl, when, at the close of eve
> She gathers in, mournful, her brood dispersed
> By murderous sport, and o'er the remnant spreads
> Fondly her wings: close nestling 'neath her breast,
> They cherished cower amid the purple blooms.

You will excuse my delay at this point, my lady having been a Covenanter.

In company with this last craft, you perceive a crowd of others, with hulls and riggings, and flags, declarative of their Presbyterian origin, and bearing the several names of 'The Burgher,' 'The Anti-Burgher,' 'The Puritan,' 'The Cameronian,' 'The Barean,' 'The Congregationalist,' 'The New School,' 'The Old School,' 'The Independent,' 'The Cumberland,' &c. &c.

There too sailing in deep waters for fear of fire, you behold 'The Universalist,' 'The Unitarian,' 'The Quaker,' 'The Shaker,' 'The Mennonite,' 'The Tunker,' 'The Socinian,' 'The Swedenborgh,' 'The Moravian,' 'The Mormon,' and 'The Jew.'

And on the shore are still to be seen the sad remains of vessels, men and cargoes now no more; known only by their uncouth and barbarous names, sometimes still legible upon their shattered and decaying sterns, as 'The Kinpperdoling,' 'The Joachimite,' 'The Iberian, 'The Adamite,' 'The Albanenses,' 'The Amaurite,' 'The Anabaptist,' 'The Archontic,' 'The Bardesanite,' 'The Beghard', 'The Behemenist,' 'The Bethlehemite,' 'The Beddelian,' 'The Barcellist,' 'The Bourignonist,' 'The Buchanite,' 'The Millenarian,' 'The Circoncellion,' 'The Coccesion, 'The Ebeonite,' and 'The glorious Waldenses, Albygensis, &c.

In the centre of the squadron you see a ship of wonderful extent, and plain rigging, full spread, well manned and a fast sailer. If you will watch un-

til her stem is towards us, you will perceive that she is named 'The Protestant Methodist.' Behind her is another called 'The Episcopal Methodist,' steered by pilots who are called Bishops, against which some of the crew taking exceptions in 1827, fled to that next vessel which is stiled 'The Associate Methodist.' This, it is supposed by some, was a leap only from the frying pan into the fire. But to conclude, the original vessel was built and launched by the famous John Wesley, Morgan and others, in 1729.

Do you see that ship styled Baptist.

I see several vessels with that name upon them.

Correct: you see 'The Particular Baptist,' 'The General Baptist,' 'The Regular Baptist,' 'The Freewill Baptist,' 'The Freecommunion Baptist,' 'The Seventh Day Baptist,' 'The Six principles Baptist,' and 'The Emancipator Baptist.' This class of ships is generally of good bottom. The crew aboard are volunteers, and of them in Americans alone, are more than 2,000,000!

What means that chasm in the side of 'The Regular Baptist,' with some other marks of disaster, which I see in 'The Presbyterian,' 'The Universalist,' 'The Seceder,' 'The Infidel,' 'Atheist,' &c. &c.

I shall explain. Do you see these three ships laying near to shore, taking in numerous passengers and bearing the several names of 'The Christian,' 'The Church of God' and 'The Restoration.'

I do.

Well then, in the first of them, viz: 'The Christian' you see standing with his hand upon the helm, a man of patriarchal appearance, with a black coat and a broad brimmed hat, do you not?

I do.

That, Sir, is the man who for many years has guided with unvarying hand the stately vessel which you now look at, blameless, not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker and not given to filthy lucre, he is a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate! and firm as a STONE he holdeth fast the faithful compass in the binacle before him. After maintaining through a long series of years, the high distinction of pilot to 'The Christian,' he is now ready, as he has shown, to resign his post to the person to whom the Great Captain of Salvation shall see meet to give it in charge. May he die in the midst of his brethren? with the word of peace on his lips, and glory in his soul!

'The Church of God' is a vessel of original mould and bottom, but differing in the first instance from the Christian, which, as originally fitted out, had more sail than ballast. The Church had more ballast than sail, and so moved forward tardily till meeting with 'The Restoration, she hoisted an additional sail and now the three ships are all along to Jerusalem, in a league of peace and amity!

But to 'the Restoration.' You must see, Sir, that she is a vessel of the divinest and most peculi .r mould. I do not refer to any display she makes, for she makes none; but look at the length and strength and sturdiness of her timbers! her keel and ribs are made as for eternity! and within her capacious

walls may walk at ease, if they would walk in *the truth*, the whole world of mankind.

Who is that Apostolick looking personage behind the binacle, with heaven in his eye, and gazing full upon the northern and polar star?

That, Sir, is the man who laid her beams in the Bible. Mark the height and capacity of his forehead! the depth and strength and colour of the eye that coucheth underneath, the intellect and argument developed in the length and weight and mobility of his cheek—the massy ear and the veneration of his sil very locks, that now stream to the wintry winds like the bright radiations of light! and say whether, as he stands, he does not realize to you all that you have imagined of the venerable Nestor, Nestor of Sandy Pylos! Holy, vigilent and indefatigable, and avoiding questions which engender strife, like a true servant of God, he is gentle towards all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those who oppose themselves, if God peradventure, will grant them repentance unto the acknowledgment of the truth, and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the Devil, who are taken captive at his will. The father of believing children, and ruling well his own house, a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, his soul looketh forth from her clayey tenement towards heaven on high. He shall die the death of the righteous; his last end shall be his!

And who is that with a strong hand upon the helm, eying the whole squadron of the Reformation, as if he would run them down?

Names are odious, Sir:—The distinction and priority which he there enjoys, has been well earned. Do you see his face? There is not a straight line in it! and nature, as if she had determined there should be none, besides giving the nasal organ an elevation truly Roman, has slightly inclined the whole to one side—the right side! The lip too, and the azure eye, edged with the fire of the bird of Jove, yield in the same direction; while the well developed frontal sinuses the marble, forehead and the whole cinciputal region, give forth all the marks of the depth, the extent, the variety and the fervour of which he has proved himself possessed.

Why do so many keep gazing at him from the decks of the other vessels—'The Presbyterian,'—'The Seceder,'—'The Infidel,' &c. &c?

Mark, Sir, the extraordinary developement behind his ear, and enquire no more; he has run the prow of the Restoration into almost every ship of any size in the fleet, and these groups upon the decks are poor folks met to deplore the disasters and the fortunes of their Clacks, and Noels, and Wallers, and Broaddasses, McCallas, Jennings, &c. &c.; and yon chasm in the hull of the Regular Baptist, which you have noticed, and which the men aboard are tinkering at, is the hole which he hammered out, and at which he and his associates leapt forth. Valiant for the truth in the earth; and fearing nothing but God and evil, may he till death maintain by honor and righteousness, the high distinction and priority which he now enjoys, and then having gone, his name and his fame shall be in the mouth of all saints, greater than if written on the blue firmament with a pen of gold! better than if poured in letters of living gold along the sky!

Who is that lean man behind him, with his eye devouring the compass in the binacle, and whose head the Pilot would raise from his bosom, whereon it had reclined?

No names, Sir,—if he leapt from the chasm first, bearing along with him the flag of Union, he is to be borne with. It is well his purposes are divine and founded in truth for *you* cannot turn him.

And who are all these joyous men, and officers aboard crowding around the helm.

These, Sir, are all volunteers, and singing as you hear

> The everlasting Gospel has launched the deep at last;
> Behold her sails unfurled upon her towering mast!
> Her joyous crew upon the deck in loving order stand,
> Crying 'Ho here we go for Immanuel's happy land.'

But you will say the above is written rather to praise certain persons whom I love, than to give a history of any particular fact in the Reformation which was what I promised to do, viz: 'The practical Restoration of the Ancient Gospel. Well, Sir, honor to whom honor is due; but I shall drop my figure and turn from persons to the fact in question.

In 1827, then, there were three parties on the carpet, struggling to restore original christianity. The first of them calling themselves *the Churches of Christ.* The second calling themselves *Christians*, and the third laying at that time chiefly in the bosom of the Regular Baptist Churches, and originating with the writings and labours of Bro A. Campbell. To the first of these party's concerning which more particularly by and by, up to 1826 belonged.

Your humble servant, W. S.

FOR THE EVANGELIST.

'But yet in this tent we groan, earnestly desiring to go permanently into our habitation, which is heavenly.'

> As weary trav'lers in a tent, cheerless and sad we groan,
> We've left our kindred and our friends, and tarry here from home;
> The night is dark, and solitude has spread its raven wing,
> And earth, with all its charms to us, is but a worthless thing.
>
> And we are hastening to a place, delectable for rest;
> And soon we hope to lay us down, and calm our weary breast;
> With earnest wish, with strong desire, we look for happier days,
> When we shall spend a glorious life in more than mortal praise.
>
> We now are like the panting hart, pursued by eager foe,
> And ev'ry moment as it flies, we look to be brought low;
> When morning lifts its curtain up, and shows a cheerful sky,
> In deep suspense our souls are held, for 'we do daily die.'
>
> Weary and faint, we yet pursue, our prize is still before,
> Tho' many a stormy night may come, and many a tempest roar;
> A habitation in the skies to faithful men is given,
> A house not made with mortal hands, high in the abodes of heaven.

J. CHALLEN.

CORRESPONDENCE.

From brother Poindexter, Lexington, Ky.; 'Dear brother Scott: I am pleased to see your discourse on the Holy Spirit in this month's Evangelist as some of our brethren here were desirous to possess themselves of it. I consider this an important document; for the subject is but badly understood by the public in general, and also by some of our teachers in particular. A box of the original publication has been sent on hither by brother Campbell for brother Smith.'

Brother Grafton, Kings Creek, says of the success of the Gospel in his region 'that it took up all the honest hearted last summer.' May it never take up any other!

'Dear brother Scott, Grace to you, and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ. I thank God on every remembrance of you for the grace given you through Jesus Christ: your Evangelist is instructive and pleasing, in nothing tiresome, but knowing it is the lot of man to err, I examine with jealous scrutiny every thing both of my own and others. There are still two subjects which I do not think understood according to the divine oracles—*Marriage* and *Bishops*. Many of the disciples are well pleased with your history of the 'Restoration of the Ancient Gospel.' Let us know when you will come up, that we may make appointments.

JAMES McELLROY.'

Brother James, come for me.—Ed.

From brother W. E. Matthews, Miss.: 'Dear brother Scott: a year has rolled round and we have received and read the Evangelist; suffice it to say, we are happy to find it so admirably comporting with its name and pretensions; may it continue to receive increased support. The Reformation is still progressing in Mississippi.

From Brother S. C. Dunning, Savannah, Georgia.

'Brother Scott: Allow me through the medium of your periodical to submit a few remarks to all those who love the truth. I rejoice in the principles and progress of the reformation, which is pursuing the even tenor of its way, towards a glorious result;—already the barren heath is becoming a fruitful field, and the wilderness beginning to blossom as the rose, which may fill our hearts with gratitude, and employ our tongues in praise and thanksgiving to him, who loved us and gave himself for us; how cheering the sound of Heavenly Philanthropy which tells us, that we are reconciled to God by the death of his Son; and also tells us that this blissful truth is carried out in all its superlative grandeur, to the final consummation of a glorious immortality.

I have endeavored to watch with care the progress of the reformation for the past ten years, and have need to admire enough to cause the tear of joy to flow: and when I think of the faithful few who began, and yet continue their untiring efforts to complete the work, I joyfully respond, go onward to rear in its primitive simplicity and splendour, the temple of Jehovah's residence, until Zion shall be the joy of the whole earth; but there are a few particulars (if I mistake not the New Testament instruction) that require a passing notice; it is this, that all disciples, should without delay, obey the instructions of the King, even if they have been previously in communion with Baptists or other churches, which do not obey these instructions. The apostles separated the disciples, and certainly for the purpose that they might obey the institutions of the great lawgiver.

But it will be said that they were separated from the unbelieving multitude; this I acknowledge, yet I conceive the principle surely applicable to any other religious society, who obey not Jesus; the mere fact of their profession, changes no principle of application, provided they obey not: the mere pagentry of outward traditionary observ-

ances, which have no sanction of divine authority, surely cannot be a society to be sought after, and from such let the reformed separate; on this subject disguise is unnecessary, and totally unworthy of any who advocate the truth.

If to obey Jesus we are under certain circumstances to forsake our near relatives, surely to obey Jesus it is necessary to separate from those who hold the traditions of men in higher reverence than the words of the Lord. Let it be done without delay, we all say to a believer in Jesus, be immersed, carry out the principle of obedience as at Jerusalem, 2d chap. Acts, v. 2d. We say not to a Roman Catholic or Presbyterian who make the good confession, go back and remain in your present religious connection; we now say, obey in all things the institutions of our absent Lord—does truth make an exception in favour of a Baptist church? I trust not.

I would say to all who love the institutions of Jesus, come out from among the Baptists and all others who disobey the Lord of Glory, not for the purpose of causing a division, but from the neceesity which truth lays them under to obey their acknowedged lawgiver; the spirit in which all this should be done, surely should be characterized by all the gentleness and brotheriy love, which should ever adorn all disciples. Necessity was laid on the apostles to proclaim the gospel; and I am yet to learn if necessity is not laid on every disciples to obey, even should this cause a withdrawal from his brethren, provided, obedience to him who shed his precious blood demanded it.'

Bro. Dibble of N. Lisbon is appointed our agent for that town. In a letter of last month, he says; Bro. Jones of Wooster belonging to the Regular Baptists, visited us, and we, the disciples, hardly knew how to appreciate the truth, until we heard this man proclaim again, the old Calvanistic errors.

A letter from our beloved brother Aylett Rains, says, 'The Congregation in the vicinity of Wilmington, are, all things considered, doing as well as could be expected. The brother adds, 'There never was a period in which more energetic measures were necessary. May the Lord strengthen his servants.'

We thank our beloved brother for all his kindness; and concur with him in his judgement of the interesting nature of the present *crisis*. May the Lord strengthen him.—Ed.

Bro. Wm. Dowling of Marion Co. O. says, the disciples in his quarter are in great spirits at present; and are aided by the labours of Secrist, Jones, Miliron, Wells, Sergeant and B. Walker, who are employed in bringing many in righteousness.

Bro. Steel, of Richmond Ky. says, 'The good work of converting sinners to the Prince of Peace by those persons called Reformers is going on in this country—we have many able proclaimers. John Smith, within a year, has himself immersed upwards of 200 persons.

Bro. Alvin Kyes writes, 'Since I saw you I have been ordained an Elder without the laying on of hands, and the sectarians do not like it: I am not a great teacher, but I trust in God for all strength.'

The above Bro. has at least the blessedness of having converted nearly all, who form the little flock.

From Bro. Williams, Ravenna, O. 'Bro. S. The ancient Gospel is performing wonders in this county, peculiar to its own intrinsic nature; it is breaking in upon the old sectarian establishments, and the careless and unthinking are roused to a sense of their folly by the force of its evidence, and by its magnificent adaptation to the wants of mah in all his situations' In short, the Reformation has outstript our most sanguine expectations.

RESOURCES OF THE EUROPEAN POWERS.

We extract from an article in the London Courier, the following statement of the comparative means and resources of the five great powers of Europe, immediately affected by the contemplated hostilities between Holland on the one side, and England and France on the other. The conclusions drawn by the Courier, from the statement is, that as a naval and defensive power, Great Britain stands prominent, but that as as a military aggressor on the continent, she is powerless.—*Gaz.*

	Millions.
The *population* of Russia is about	60,000,000
Austria,	33,000,000
Prussia,	13,000,000
France,	33,000,000
Great Britain,	24,000,000
The *Revenue* of Russia	14,000,000
Austria,	12,000,000
Prussia,	8,000,000
France,	38,000,000
Britain,	55,000,000
National Debt of Russia,	55,000,000
Austria,	60,000,000
Prussia,	28,000,000
France,	200,000,000
G. Britain,	770,000,000
Disposal Revenue after paying the interest of the National Debt.	
Russia,	11,000,000
Austria,	9,000,000
Prussia,	6,250,000
France,	28,000,000
G. Britain,	26,000,000
Soldiers of all kinds Russia,	600,000
Austria,	350,000
Prussia,	250,000
France,	400,000
G. Britain,	110,000
Vessels of War, Russia	128
Austria,	72
Prussia,	2
France,	320
G. Britain,	504

	Ships of the line.	Frigates.	Armed vessels.
Russia has	46	30	50
Austria,	3	8	61
Prussia,	2		
France,	162	35	207
G. Britain,	272	118	325